

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KIRK PERNELL JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 24-cv-242-pp

NURSE LAUREN CLEXTON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED
WITHOUT PREPAYING FILING FEE (DKT. NO. 2) AND SCREENING
COMPLAINT UNDER 28 U.S.C. §1915A**

Plaintiff Kirk Pernell Johnson, who is incarcerated at Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility and is representing himself, filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. §1983, alleging that the defendants violated his constitutional rights. This decision resolves the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee, dkt. no. 2, and screens his complaint, dkt. no. 1.

**I. Motion for Leave to Proceed without Prepaying the Filing Fee
(Dkt. No. 2)**

The Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA) applies to this case because the plaintiff was incarcerated when he filed his complaint. See 28 U.S.C. §1915(h). The PLRA lets the court allow an incarcerated plaintiff to proceed with his case without prepaying the civil case filing fee. 28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(2). When funds exist, the plaintiff must pay an initial partial filing fee. 28 U.S.C. §1915(b)(1). He then must pay the balance of the \$350 filing fee over time, through deductions from his prisoner account. Id.

On March 14, 2024, the court ordered the plaintiff to pay an initial partial filing fee of \$37.67. Dkt. No. 8. The court received that fee on April 2, 2024. The court will grant the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee and will require him to pay remainder of the filing fee over time in the manner explained at the end of this order.

II. Screening the Complaint

A. Federal Screening Standard

Under the PLRA, the court must screen complaints brought by incarcerated persons seeking relief from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. §1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint if the incarcerated plaintiff raises claims that are legally “frivolous or malicious,” that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §1915A(b).

In determining whether the complaint states a claim, the court applies the same standard that it applies when considering whether to dismiss a case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). See Cesal v. Moats, 851 F.3d 714, 720 (7th Cir. 2017) (citing Booker-El v. Superintendent, Ind. State Prison, 668 F.3d 896, 899 (7th Cir. 2012)). To state a claim, a complaint must include “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The complaint must contain enough facts, accepted as true, to “state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atlantic Corp. v.

Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows a court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” Id. (citing Twombly, 550 U.S. at 556).

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983, a plaintiff must allege that someone deprived him of a right secured by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, and that whoever deprived him of this right was acting under the color of state law. D.S. v. E. Porter Cnty. Sch. Corp., 799 F.3d 793, 798 (7th Cir. 2015) (citing Buchanan-Moore v. County of Milwaukee, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009)). The court construes liberally complaints filed by plaintiffs who are representing themselves and holds such complaints to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by lawyers. Cesal, 851 F.3d at 720 (citing Perez v. Fenoglio, 792 F.3d 768, 776 (7th Cir. 2015)).

B. The Plaintiff’s Allegations

The plaintiff alleges that on October 17, 2023, when he was confined at the House of Correction in Franklin, Wisconsin (which is now called the Milwaukee County Community Reintegration Center), defendant Lauren Clexton issued him “atorvastatin” for his cholesterol “that was found[] out months later that the medication had been recalled.” Dkt. No. 1 at 2. The plaintiff states that on November 5, 2023, he was transferred to the Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility (MSDF), where he was given the medication until January 5, 2024. Id. He alleges that a nurse at MSDF noticed that he was

taking that medication and on January 5 took it away because she discovered that day that the drug had been recalled. Id. at 2-3.

The plaintiff states that atorvastatin is known to deteriorate the muscle tissue in legs and that he has a knot on his right leg and a couple on his knee that the doctor says are lipoma.¹ Id. at 3. The plaintiff states that because of the medication he can hardly walk, he cannot stand in the shower and he cannot talk on the phone without his legs hurting. Id. The plaintiff alleges that his meals must be brought to him and he cannot sit in the dayroom with other incarcerated individuals because it is painful. Id.

The plaintiff states that he seeks damages from the defendants for not giving him the treatment he needs in a hospital and for giving him a medication that caused more issues. Id. He seeks compensatory damages and immediate release from custody so he can visit his primary doctor regularly. Id. at 4.

C. Analysis

It is not clear whether the plaintiff was in the House of Correction and MSDF as a pretrial detainee or a criminally convicted person during the events described in the complaint. If he was a “pretrial detainee,” his rights arise out of the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause; if he was a criminally convicted incarcerated individual, his rights arise out of the Eighth

¹ “A lipoma is a slow-growing, fatty lump that’s most often situated between [the] skin and the underlying muscle layer. A lipoma, which feels doughy and usually isn’t tender, moves readily with slight finger pressure. Lipomas are usually detected in middle age. Some people have more than one lipoma. A lipoma isn’t cancer and usually is harmless.” <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/lipoma>, last visited April 28, 2024.

Amendment. See Miranda v. County of Lake, 900 F.3d 335, 350-51 (7th Cir. 2018) (explaining that an objective reasonableness standard applies to claims brought by pretrial detainees while a deliberate indifference standard applies to claims brought by incarcerated persons).

A §1983 claim that a state pretrial detainee has received inadequate medical care is predicated on the rights secured by the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause. James v. Hale, 959 F.3d 307, 318 (7th Cir. 2020) (citing Miranda, 900 F.3d 335, 346-47 (7th Cir. 2018)). Claims of inadequate medical care while in pretrial detention are subject to an objective reasonableness standard. Id. (citing Miranda, 900 F.3d at 352). The plaintiff bears the burden to demonstrate objective unreasonableness, and he must make a two-part showing. Id. First, he must show that the defendants acted purposefully, knowingly or recklessly when considering the consequences of their response to the medical condition at issue in the case. Id. (citing McCann v. Ogle County, Ill., 909 F.3d 881, 886 (7th Cir. 2018)). Second, the plaintiff must show that the challenged conduct was objectively unreasonable given the totality of the relevant facts and circumstances. Id.

A prison official violates the Eighth Amendment's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment when he or she acts with deliberate indifference to the serious medical need of an incarcerated individual. Cesal v. Moats, 851 F.3d 714, 720-21 (7th Cir. 2017) (citing Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976)). To state a claim for deliberate indifference for deficient medical care, the plaintiff "must allege an objectively serious medical condition and an

official's deliberate indifference to that condition." *Id.* at 721 (quoting Perez v. Fenoglio, 792 F.3d 768, 776 (7th Cir. 2015)). An objectively serious medical need is one that has either been diagnosed by a physician and demands treatment or is "so obvious that even a lay person would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor's attention." *Id.* (quoting King v. Kramer, 680 F.3d 1013, 1018 (7th Cir. 2012)). The deliberate indifference standard is subjective and requires a plaintiff to allege that the official knew of, but disregarded, a substantial risk to the individual's health. *Id.* (citing Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 836-38 (1994); Greeno v. Daley, 414 F.3d 645, 653 (7th Cir. 2005)).

It is not clear whether the plaintiff is alleging that the atorvastatin was recalled months after Clexton gave it to him, or whether it had been recalled at the time she gave it to him. Either way, the plaintiff has not stated a claim under either the Fourteenth or Eighth Amendment based on allegations that defendant Clexton issued him atorvastatin in October 2023, nor has he stated a claim based on allegations that he was prescribed atorvastatin at MSDF. He has not alleged that any defendant knowingly prescribed him medication that that defendant knew had been recalled. The plaintiff cannot proceed on a claim under the Eighth or Fourteenth Amendment based on allegations that he was prescribed atorvastatin.

The plaintiff may be alleging that he has not been provided medical care for the condition of his legs. The court will give the plaintiff an opportunity to amend his complaint in case he wishes to make such allegations.

The court is enclosing a copy of its amended complaint form. The plaintiff must use this form for his amended complaint. See Civil Local Rule 9(b). (E.D. Wis.). The plaintiff must list the case number for this case on the first page. He must list all the defendants he wants to sue in the caption of the amended complaint. He should use the spaces on pages two and three to-explain the key facts that give rise to the claims he wishes to bring, and to describe which defendants he believes committed the violations that relate to each claim. If there is not enough space on those pages, the plaintiff may use up to five additional sheets of paper, double-spaced so that the court can read them. The amended complaint takes the place of the prior complaint and must be complete in itself; the plaintiff may not refer the court or other readers back to facts in the previous complaint.

When writing his amended complaint, the plaintiff should provide the court with enough facts to answer the following questions: 1) Who violated his constitutional rights?; 2) What did each person do to violate his rights?; 3) Where did each person violate his rights?; and 4) When did each person violate his rights? The amended complaint does not need to be long or contain legal language or citations to statutes or cases, but it does need to provide the court and each defendant with notice of what each defendant allegedly did or did not do to violate his rights.

III. Conclusion

The court **GRANTS** the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 2.

The court **CONCLUDES** that the plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim. Dkt. No. 1.

The court **ORDERS** that the plaintiff may file an amended complaint that complies with the instructions in this order. If the plaintiff chooses to file an amended complaint, he must do so in time for the court to *receive* it by the end of the day on **May 22, 2024**. If the court receives an amended complaint by the end of the day on May 22, 2024, the court will screen the amended complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. §1915A. If the court does not receive either an amended complaint or a request for more time to file one by the May 22, 2024 deadline, the court will dismiss this case based on the plaintiff's failure to state a claim in the original complaint and will issue him a strike as required by 28 U.S.C. §1915(g).

The court **ORDERS** that the agency that has custody of the plaintiff must collect from his institution trust account the **\$312.33** balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from the plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the plaintiff's trust account and forwarding payments to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1915(b)(2). The agency must clearly identify the payments by the case name and number. If the plaintiff transfers to another county, state or federal institution, the transferring institution must forward a copy of this order, along with the plaintiff's remaining balance, to the receiving institution.

The court will send a copy of this order to Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility, where the plaintiff is confined.

The court **ORDERS** that plaintiffs who are incarcerated at Prisoner E-Filing Program institutions² must submit all correspondence and case filings to institution staff, who will scan and e-mail documents to the court. Plaintiffs who are incarcerated at all other prison facilities must submit the original document for each filing to the court to the following address:

Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
Eastern District of Wisconsin
362 United States Courthouse
517 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

DO NOT MAIL ANYTHING DIRECTLY TO THE JUDGE'S CHAMBERS. It will only delay the processing of the case.


The court advises the plaintiff that, if he fails to file documents or take other required actions by the deadlines the court sets, the court may dismiss the case based on his failure to diligently pursue it. The parties must notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address. The court advises the plaintiff that it is his responsibility to promptly notify the court if he is released from custody or transferred to a different institution. The plaintiff's failure to keep the court advised of his address may result in the court dismissing this case without further notice.

² The Prisoner E-Filing Program is mandatory for all individuals incarcerated at Green Bay Correctional Institution, Waupun Correctional Institution, Dodge Correctional Institution, Wisconsin Secure Program Facility, Columbia Correctional Institution, and Oshkosh Correctional Institution.

The court will include a guide prepared by court staff to address common questions that arise in cases filed by prisoners. Entitled “Answers to Prisoner Litigants’ Common Questions,” this guide contains information that the plaintiff may find useful in prosecuting his case.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 30th day of April, 2024.

BY THE COURT:



HON. PAMELA PEPPER
Chief United States District Judge